

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Kathy Reaves,

PLAINTIFF

v.

IDENTEGO/IDEMIA, South Carolina
Law Enforcement Division,

DEFENDANTS

Case No. 3:22-cv-1399-TLW

Order

Plaintiff Kathy Reaves, proceeding pro se, filed this civil action against Defendants IDENTEGO/IDEMIA and the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division. ECF No. 1. The matter now comes before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) filed by the magistrate judge to whom this case was assigned. ECF No. 13.

In the Report, the magistrate judge recommends that Plaintiff's complaint be summarily dismissed because her allegations are duplicative of her allegations in Case No. 4:22-cv-00318-TLW-TER. *See id.* at 3. Further, the magistrate judge noted that "[i]t is a waste of judicial resources to request Plaintiff [to] name actual persons as defendants instead of an agency as the court already did this in No. 4:22-cv-318 and Plaintiff is pursuing some individual defendants, regarding this same incident in that court action." *Id.* at 4. The Report concludes that "Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted and this action is subject to summary dismissal[.] *Id.* at 5. Plaintiff did not file objections to the Report. This matter is now

ripe for decision.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that Report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, “a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Report. For the reasons stated by the magistrate judge, the Report, ECF No. 13, is **ACCEPTED**. This matter is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
Senior United States District Judge

November 7, 2022
Columbia, South Carolina